

December 7-8, 2019 || New Haven, Connecticut

National Parks Division

		Dou	nd 1	Rou	nd I	Dou	nd 3	Dou	nd 4	Summary
			Binghamton	Δ v. Per				π v. I		Summary 5.2.0
American			_	1	1		Dayton	πν. 1 W		5-3-0
	WLT	W +4	L -2	L -17	L -2	W +1	W +8		W +19	CS: 11.5 OCS: 63.5
Ecrins	PD	Δ v. T		$\pi v. Ro$			⁺ ₀ western B		nerican	PD: 20
	NH T			1				1		3-5-0
BU A	WLT	L	L	W	W +8	L	W	L -9	L -19	CS: 14.5 OCS: 62
Lassen	PD	-11	-12	+12		-5	+2			PD: -34
Chicago	WIT	Δ v. N		π v. South			nn State	1	ufts A	5-1-2
Chicago	WLT	W	Т	W	W	W	W	L -3	T	CS: 15.5 OCS: 71
Iguazu	PD	+8	0 IUC A	+15	+10	+2	+12 western A	Δ v. Min		PD: 44
Columbia A	WLT	Δ v. U L	W	π v. D W	W	W	L	L	L L	4-4-0 CS: 15.5 OCS: 69
	PD	L -6	•• +1	•• +5	•• +4	•• +3	L -7	-3	L -11	PD: -14
Zambezi	PD	-0 π v. Hi	-	Δ v. North			-7 (ale B	-	-11 IUC A	
Cornell College A	WLT	л v. п Т	_	L L	W W	W	W	Δ V. U W	L	4-3-1 CS: 12.5 OCS: 65.5
Acadia	PD	1 0	L -9	-13	•• +7	•• +7	•• +4	•• +6	L -2	PD: 0
Асиини	FD	π v. Per		Δ v. Col			nerican		-2 getown A	0-7-1
Dayton	WLT	πν. rei T		L L		L L	L	L L	L	U-7-1 CS: 16.5 OCS: 56
Badlands	PD	1 0	L -9	-5	L -4	-1	L -8	-13	L -20	PD: -60
Duulunus	rD	σ π v.]	-	Δ v. We			-o ufts A		Zale A	8-0-0
Fordham LC A	WLT	W	W	W W	W	W W	W	W X V. I	W	CS: 14.5 OCS: 78.5
Etosha	PD	•• +6	+11	+4	•• +6	+19	•• +4	+10	+6	PD: 66
Elosnu	FD	-	ichigan		sleyan A		ochester		ayton	4-4-0
Georgetown A	WLT	L	L	L	L	W W	W	W V. L	W	CS: 12 OCS: 64
Taroko	PD	-3	-10	-2	-7	+8	+10	+13	+20	PD: 29
1 41 0 1.0			l College A	$\pi v. U$			nesota A		western A	3-4-1
Hillsdale	WLT	T	W	W	L	L	W	L	L	CS: 19.5 OCS: 65
Haleakala	PD	0	+9	+2	-5	-3	+2	-3	-6	PD: -4
		Δ v. Geor	getown A	π v. North	western A	π ν. Υ		Δv. We	sleyan B	5-3-0
Michigan	WLT	W	W	L	W	L	L	W	W	CS: 17.5 OCS: 72
Banff	PD	+3	+10	-6	+2	-9	-25	+5	+16	PD: -4
55		π v. Y	'ale A	Δ v. SUNY	Binghamton	Δ v. H	illsdale	π v. Col	umbia A	5-2-1
Minnesota A	WLT	W	L	W	Т	W	L	W	W	CS: 17 OCS: 72.5
Arches	PD	+1	-1	+8	0	+3	-2	+3	+11	PD: 23
		π v. Wes	sleyan A	Δ v. M	ichigan	Δ v. Col	umbia A	π v. Hi	illsdale	5-2-1
Northwestern A	WLT	W	Т	W	L	L	W	W	W	CS: 18 OCS: 69.5
Yellowstone	PD	+2	0	+6	-2	-3	+7	+3	+6	PD: 19
		Δ v. South	n Carolina	π v. Cornel	l College A	Δ v.]	BU A	π v. Prir	iceton A	3-5-0
Northwestern B	WLT	W	L	W	L	W	L	L	L	CS: 15.5 OCS: 56.5
Saguaro	PD	+2	-4	+13	-7	+5	-2	-7	-3	PD: -3



December 7-8, 2019 || New Haven, Connecticut

National Parks Division

		Dou	nd 1		nd 2			Dau	nd 4	Summan
			nd 1		nd 2 (ale A		I nd 3 Texas		nu 4 h Carolina	Summary
			hicago			1		1		3-4-1
NYU A	WLT	L -8	Т	L -7	L	W +9	W +8	W +8	L	CS: 15 OCS: 69
Isle Royale	PD	-	0 Dayton		-6 nerican		+8 Chicago	$\pi v. Wes$	-4 slevan A	PD: 0 3-4-1
Penn State	WLT	Д ү . Ц Т	W	W W	W	L L	L	L	L	CS: 17 OCS: 60.5
Sequoia	PD	0	+9	+17	+2	-2	-12	-4	-1	PD: 9
Dequota	10		ochester		ufts A		sleyan B		western B	5-3-0
Princeton A	WLT	W	W	L	L	W	L	W	W	CS: 12.5 OCS: 70.5
North Cascades	PD	+12	+8	-6	-6	+4	-6	+7	+3	PD: 16
		π v. Prir	nceton A	Δ v.	BU A	π v. Geor	getown A	Δ ν. [Texas	1-7-0
Rochester	WLT	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	W	CS: 13 OCS: 53.5
Olympic	PD	-12	-8	-12	-8	-8	-10	-2	+5	PD: -55
v 1		π v. North	western B	Δ v. C	hicago	Δ v. SUNY	Binghamton	π v. N	YU A	3-5-0
South Carolina	WLT	L	W	L	L	W	L	L	W	CS: 17 OCS: 61.5
Torres del Paine	PD	-2	+4	-15	-10	+16	-2	-8	+4	PD: -13
SUNY		Δ v. At	nerican	π v. Min	nesota A	π v. South	h Carolina	Δ v. Υ	ale B	4-3-1
Binghamton	WLT	L	W	L	Т	L	W	W	W	CS: 15.5 OCS: 58.5
Agulhas	PD	-4	+2	-8	0	-16	+2	+7	+5	PD: -12
		Δ v. Ford	ham LC A	π v. Υ	ale B	Δ v. N	IYU A	π v. Ro	chester	1-7-0
Texas	WLT	L	L	L	L	L	L	W	L	CS: 14.5 OCS: 55.5
Congaree	PD	-6	-11	-9	-17	-9	-8	+2	-5	PD: -63
		π ν. Ι	BU A	Δ v. Prin	nceton A	Δ v. Ford	ham LC A	π v. C	hicago	5-2-1
Tufts A	WLT	W	W	W	W	L	L	W	Т	CS: 22 OCS: 57
Huangshan	PD	+11	+12	+6	+6	-19	-4	+3	0	PD: 15
		π v. Col	umbia A	Δ ν. Η	illsdale	Δ v. We	esleyan A	π v. Cornel	l College A	4-4-0
UIUC A	WLT	W	L	L	W	W	L	L	W	CS: 17.5 OCS: 64.5
Eifel	PD	+6	-1	-2	+5	+9	-10	-6	+2	PD: 3
			western A		getown A	1	IUC A	1	nn State	5-2-1
Wesleyan A	WLT	L	Т	W	W	L	W	W	W	CS: 17 OCS: 64.5
Amboseli	PD	-2	0	+2	+7	-9	+10	+4	+1	PD: 13
			ale B		ham LC A	1	nceton A	1	ichigan	3-5-0
Wesleyan B	WLT	W	W	L	L	L	W	L	L	CS: 20 OCS: 57.5
Tulum	PD	+6	+9	-4	-6	-4	+6	-5	-16	PD: -14
.			nesota A		IYU A	1	lichigan	I	nam LC A	5-3-0
Yale A	WLT	L	W	W	W	W	W	L	L	CS: 22 OCS: 64
Everglades	PD	-1	+1	+7	+6	+9	+25	-10	-6	PD: 31
			sleyan B		Texas	1	ll College A	1	-	2-6-0
Yale B	WLT	L	L	W	W	L	L	L	L	CS: 13 OCS: 62.5
Redwood	PD	-6	-9	+9	+17	-7	-4	-7	-5	PD: -12

R1 Coin Flip: Heads. Team code closer to 'A' gets better rank.

R3 Coin Flip: Tails. Cards switch sides.



December 7-8, 2019 || New Haven, Connecticut

National Parks Division

Rou	nd 1 Round 2	Round 3	Round 4	Summary			
OUTSTANDING TRIAL TEAMS							
1	Fordham LC A	8 Wins;	CS 14.5; OCS 78.5				
2	Chicago	6 Wins;	CS 15.5; OCS 71				
3	Tufts A	5.5 Win	s; CS 22; OCS 57				
4	Northwestern A	5.5 Win	s; CS 18; OCS 69.5				
5	Minnesota A	5.5 Win	s; CS 17; OCS 72.5				
6	Wesleyan A	5.5 Win	s; CS 17; OCS 64.5				
7	Yale A	5 Wins;	CS 22; OCS 64				
8	Michigan	5 Wins;	CS 17.5; OCS 72				
9	Princeton A	5 Wins;	CS 12.5; OCS 70.5				
10	American	5 Wins;	CS 11.5; OCS 63.5				

OUTSTANDING ATTORNEYS

20	Р	Jack Beaumaster	Cornell College A
20	D	Austin Upshaw	Georgetown A
20	D	Mashell Rahimzadeh	Columbia A
19	Р	Anna Stoneman	Chicago
19	Р	Allison Du	Yale A
19	D	Bianca Blanshine	Michigan
18/17	D/P	Bri Goodchild	Minnesota A
18	Р	Max Kornfeld	NYU A
18	Р	Bee Brawley	South Carolina
18	Р	Steven Becker	Tufts A
17	D	Montana Love	Yale A
17	D	Ruby Scanlon	Northwestern A
17	Р	Amir Azadniv	American
17	D	Samantha Cupolo	SUNY Binghamton

OUTSTANDING WITNESSES

D	Sierra Townsend	Georgetown A
D	Kathryn Machanic	Wesleyan A
D	Daya Butler	Yale B
D	Tanner Scheef	Texas
D	Ali Alekri	Chicago
D	Eden Strong	Northwestern A
D	Alexandra Farina	Columbia A
D	Grace Shin	Rochester
Р	Lucas O'Hanian	Hillsdale
D	Katherine Moore	Northwestern B
D	Zach Sahin	Princeton A
Р	Emma Roder	UIUC A
Р	Lucas Piedmonte	American
	D D D D D P D D P P	 D Kathryn Machanic D Daya Butler D Tanner Scheef D Ali Alekri D Eden Strong D Alexandra Farina D Grace Shin P Lucas O'Hanian D Katherine Moore D Zach Sahin P Emma Roder

Tabulation Director: Jeffrey Guo (Yale)

Assistant Tabulation Director: Nat Warner (Northwestern, Wesleyan)

Tabulation Room Volunteers: Ed Stern (BU), Paul Bateman (Penn State), Rebecca Koper (North Central), Allen Barr (Minnesota), Paul Hubbell (St. Thomas), Clio Sophia Koller (Chicago), Drew Evans (Haverford), Kate Hayner-Slattery (Northwestern), Erica Arensman (Wesleyan), Mariana Suárez-Rebling (Yale), Allison Du (Yale)

Judges' Choice - Summary Statistics

	Count of Judges' Choice, by	Side
Side	Chosen by Judge	Percentage
Р	92	47%
D	104	53%
Total	196	

Judges' Choice Agreement with PD, by Side				
Ballots Won on Chosen by Judge on				
Side	Points	Ballots Won	Percentage	
Р	91	71	78%	
D	106	85	80%	
Total	197	156	79%	

	Judges' Choice on Tied Bal	llots
Side	Chosen in Tie	Percentage
Р	4	44%
D	5	56%
Total	9	

	Agreement by Point D	ifferential - All Wins	5
		Chosen by Judge o	n
PD	Won on Points	Ballots Won	Percentage
1-5	82	54	66%
6-10	68	59	87%
11+	47	43	91%
Total	197	156	79%

	Agreement by Point Differential - Prosecution Wins only					
	Ballots Won on	Chosen by Judge on				
PD	Points	Ballots Won	Percentage			
1-5	41	26	63%			
6-10	23	22	96%			
11+	27	23	85%			
Total	91	71	78%			

Agreement by Point Differential - Defense Wins only				
Ballots Won on Chosen by Judge on				
PD	Points	Ballots Won	Percentage	
1-5	41	28	68%	
6-10	45	37	82%	
11+	20	20	100%	
Total	106	85	80%	

Notes:

[1] Each scoring judge was asked to answer, at the bottom of their blue ballot, this question: *Which team put on the better performance?* Their answer to this question constitutes their "judge's choice."

[2] Twelve ballots (four won by the Defense, six by the Prosecution, and two Ties) did not contain a judge's choice.

[3] The figures above are calculated using ballot data from both divisions.

[4] Raw data can be downloaded at

https://app.box.com/s/j51rlm4lfz11kuw7mmbj4sa38zlzb737.